Relation between fundamental estimation limit and stability in linear quantum systems with imperfect measurement

Naoki Yamamoto*
Department of Engineering, Australian National University, ACT 0200, Australia

Shinji Hara†
Department of Information Physics and Computing,
University of Tokyo, Hongo 7-3-1, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

(Dated: February 5, 2008)

From the noncommutative nature of quantum mechanics, estimation of canonical observables $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$ is essentially restricted in its performance by the Heisenberg uncertainty relation, $\langle\Delta\hat{q}^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}^2\rangle \geq \hbar^2/4$. This fundamental lower-bound may become bigger when taking the structure and quality of a specific measurement apparatus into account. In this paper, we consider a particle subjected to a linear dynamics that is continuously monitored with efficiency $\eta \in (0,1]$. It is then clarified that the above Heisenberg uncertainty relation is replaced by $\langle\Delta\hat{q}^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}^2\rangle \geq \hbar^2/4\eta$ if the monitored system is unstable, while there exists a stable quantum system for which the Heisenberg limit is reached.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Lc

arXiv:0709.3352v1 [quant-ph] 21 Sep 2007

In quantum mechanics, any noncommutative observables must possess a fundamental uncertainty due to the absence of their joint probability distribution. For example, if we estimate the position and momentum operators of a single particle, $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$, the estimation errors $\Delta\hat{q}$ and $\Delta\hat{p}$ satisfy the Heisenberg uncertainty relation $\langle\Delta\hat{q}^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}^2\rangle \geq \hbar^2/4$. Several type of such uncertainty bounds have been found in quite general formulation that even includes effects of measurement [1, 2]. It is clearly significant to perform further detailed investigation on fundamental estimation limit taking the structure, properties, and quality of a specific estimator into account.

The *quantum filter* [3, 4, 5, 6, 7] is a particularly important estimator, because of its potential application to quantum feedback control [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. More specifically, for a continuously monitored system, the quantum filter generates an optimal estimate of a system observable, which can be fed back to control the system. The estimator is recursively computed using the *Belavkin filtering equation*; this completely reflects the structure of the monitored system. Hence, within the framework of quantum filtering, the estimation limit is determined by dynamical properties of the system, e.g., the stability.

In this paper, we particularly focus on a single one-dimensional particle that has a quadratic potential and a linear interaction with a vacuum electromagnetic field, the latter of which is continuously measured by a homodyne detector [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23]. For this system, the filtering equation is reduced to the famous *Kalman filter*, and eventually the estimation error can be evaluated explicitly. The goal of this paper is to show that, irrespective of parameters of the system, there exists a fundamental estimation limit determined by the dynamical stability properties of the system. In particular, we show that a new estimation limit on $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$ appears if the system is unstable, while there exists a stable quantum system for which the Heisenberg limit is reached.

We use the following notation: for a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, the symbols A^T, $A^\dagger$, and A^* represent its transpose, conjugate transpose, and elementwise complex conjugate of A, i.e., $A^\mathsf{T} = (a_{ji})$, $A^\dagger = (a_{ji}^*)$, and $A^* = (a_{ij}^*) = (A^\dagger)^\mathsf{T}$, respectively; these rules are applied to any rectangular matrix including column and row vectors. $\mathrm{Re}(A)$ and $\mathrm{Im}(A)$ denote the real and imaginary part of A, respectively, i.e., $(\mathrm{Re}(A))_{ij} = (a_{ij} + a_{ij}^*)/2$ and $(\mathrm{Im}(A))_{ij} = (a_{ij} - a_{ij}^*)/2\mathrm{i}$.

We first review the quantum filtering theory with the focus on a particle interacting with a field. The interaction is given by a unitary operator subjected to the following *Hudson-Parthasarathy equation* [24]:

$$\hbar d\hat{U}_t = \Big[\big(-\mathrm{i}\hat{H} - \frac{1}{2}\hat{c}^\dagger\hat{c}\big)dt + \hat{c}d\hat{B}_t^\dagger - \hat{c}^\dagger d\hat{B}_t\Big]\hat{U}_t,\ \hat{U}_0 = \hat{I}, \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{c} = c_1\hat{q} + c_2\hat{p}$. The constants $c_1,\ c_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ are determined according to the system-field interaction. The quantum Wiener process $\hat{B}_t$, which is a field operator, satisfies the following quantum Ito rule:

$$d\hat{B}_t d\hat{B}_t = 0,\ d\hat{B}_t^\dagger d\hat{B}_t = 0,\ d\hat{B}_t d\hat{B}_t^\dagger = \hbar dt,\ d\hat{B}_t^\dagger d\hat{B}_t^\dagger = 0.$$

In addition to the interaction, the particle is trapped in a quadratic harmonic potential of the form

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{x}^\mathsf{T} G\hat{x} = \frac{1}{2}(g_{11}\hat{q}^2 + g_{12}\hat{q}\hat{p} + g_{12}\hat{p}\hat{q} + g_{22}\hat{p}^2),$$

where $\hat{x} = (\hat{q},\hat{p})^\mathsf{T}$, and $G = (g_{ij})$ is a 2×2 real symmetric matrix. In the Heisenberg picture, the time-evolved position and momentum operators $\hat{q}_t = \hat{U}_t^\dagger\hat{q}\hat{U}_t$

---

*Electronic address: naoki.yamamoto@anu.edu.au
†Electronic address: Shinji˙Hara@ipc.i.u-tokyo.ac.jp

and $\hat{p}_t = \hat{U}_t^\dagger \hat{p} \hat{U}_t$ satisfy the following quantum stochastic differential equation:

$$d\hat{x}_t = A\hat{x}_t dt + \mathrm{i}\Sigma[C d\hat{B}_t^\dagger - C^* d\hat{B}_t], \tag{2}$$

where $\hat{x}_t = (\hat{q}_t, \hat{p}_t)^\mathsf{T}$. Here, we have defined

$$A := \Sigma\big[G + \mathrm{Im}(C^* C^\mathsf{T})\big],\ C := \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \end{pmatrix},\ \Sigma := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we consider to measure a field observable after the interaction. In the homodyne detection scheme, the observable to be measured is given by

$$Y'_t = \hat{U}_t^\dagger (\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\phi}\hat{B}_t + \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\phi}\hat{B}_t^\dagger)\hat{U}_t + \kappa(\hat{B}'_t + \hat{B}_t'^\dagger),$$

where $\hat{B}'_t$ is a noise uncorrelated from $\hat{B}_t$, and $\kappa \geq 0$ represents the strength of $\hat{B}'_t$. Also, $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ denotes a phase-shift parameter that should be optimized. Redefining the normalized output Y_t satisfying $dY_t^2 = dt$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dY_t = 2\sqrt{\eta}C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\hat{x}_t dt &+ \sqrt{\eta}(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\phi}d\hat{B}_t + \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\phi}d\hat{B}_t^\dagger) \\ &+ \sqrt{1-\eta}(d\hat{B}'_t + d\hat{B}_t'^\dagger), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $C_\mathrm{r} := \mathrm{Re}(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\phi}C)$ and $\eta := (1+\kappa^2)^{-1} \in (0,1]$. Remarkably, Y_t satisfies the *self-nondemolition* property $[Y_s, Y_t] = 0,\ \forall s,t$ for a fixed ϕ, which indicates that the observation $\mathcal{Y}_t = \mathrm{vN}\{Y_s \mid 0 \leq s \leq t\}$ constructs a classical stochastic process. Furthermore, Y_t satisfies the *nondemolition* condition $[Y_s, \hat{q}_t] = 0,\ [Y_s, \hat{p}_t] = 0,\ \forall s \leq t$ for a fixed ϕ. These two properties allow us to define the *quantum conditional expectations* $\pi_t(\hat{q}) = \mathbb{P}(\hat{q}_t \,|\, \mathcal{Y}_t)$ and $\pi_t(\hat{p}) = \mathbb{P}(\hat{p}_t \,|\, \mathcal{Y}_t)$, which are the best estimates of $\hat{q}_t$ and $\hat{p}_t$ in the sense of the least mean square error. Following the quantum filtering theory, we obtain a recursive equation to calculate $\pi_t(\hat{q})$ and $\pi_t(\hat{p})$:

$$\begin{aligned} d\pi_t(\hat{x}) &= A\pi_t(\hat{x})dt \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\eta}\Big[\frac{2}{\hbar}V_t C_\mathrm{r} + \Sigma^\mathsf{T} C_\mathrm{i}\Big]\big[dY_t - 2\sqrt{\eta}C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\pi_t(\hat{x})dt\big], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $C_\mathrm{i} := \mathrm{Im}(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\phi}C)$ and $\pi_t(\hat{x}) := (\pi_t(\hat{q}), \pi_t(\hat{p}))^\mathsf{T}$. Here, V_t is the symmetrized covariance matrix given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_t &:= \mathbb{P}(\,\hat{P}_t \,|\, \mathcal{Y}_t\,) \\ \hat{P}_t &:= \begin{pmatrix} \Delta\hat{q}_t^2 & \frac{1}{2}(\Delta\hat{q}_t\Delta\hat{p}_t + \Delta\hat{p}_t\Delta\hat{q}_t) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\Delta\hat{q}_t\Delta\hat{p}_t + \Delta\hat{p}_t\Delta\hat{q}_t) & \Delta\hat{p}_t^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $\Delta\hat{q}_t := \hat{q}_t - \pi_t(\hat{q})$ and $\Delta\hat{p}_t := \hat{p}_t - \pi_t(\hat{p})$ are the estimation errors. V_t satisfies the following Riccati differential equation:

$$\dot{V}_t = A'V_t + V_t A'^\mathsf{T} + D - \frac{4\eta}{\hbar}V_t C_\mathrm{r} C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T} V_t, \tag{6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A' &:= \Sigma\big[G + C_\mathrm{r}C_\mathrm{i}^\mathsf{T} + (2\eta - 1)C_\mathrm{i}C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\big], \\ D &:= \hbar\Sigma^\mathsf{T}\big[C_\mathrm{r}C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T} + (1-\eta)C_\mathrm{i}C_\mathrm{i}^\mathsf{T}\big]\Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

As Eq. (6) is deterministic, the quantum conditional expectation $V_t = \mathbb{P}(\,\hat{P}_t \,|\, \mathcal{Y}_t\,)$ is replaced by the simple expectation $V_t = \langle \hat{P}_t \rangle := \mathrm{Tr}\,[(\rho \otimes \Phi)\hat{P}_t]$, where ρ is a system state and Φ is the field vacuum state. The set of equations (4) and (6) called the *quantum Kalman filter* computes the best estimate of $\hat{q}_t$ and $\hat{p}_t$ recursively.

We here provide an important fact: Unlike the classical case where the error covariance matrix is simply a nonnegative matrix, the canonical commutation relation $[\hat{q}, \hat{p}] = \mathrm{i}\hbar$ imposes V_t to satisfy the condition

$$V_t + \frac{\mathrm{i}\hbar}{2}\Sigma \geq 0,$$

that yields the Heisenberg uncertainty relation

$$\det(V_t) \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \langle \Delta\hat{q}_t^2 \rangle \langle \Delta\hat{p}_t^2 \rangle \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4}. \tag{7}$$

This inequality does hold regardless of a measurement setup. Hence the following natural question arises. Can the Heisenberg limit $\hbar^2/4$ be reached in the linear filtering scheme discussed above? To answer this important question needs a detailed investigation of V_∞, a unique steady solution of the algebraic Riccati equation $\dot{V}_\infty = 0$ in Eq. (6). (If the Riccati equation does not have such a solution, it implies that the estimation fails; we do not take this bad scenario into account.) In particular, we aim to get a fundamental lower bound of $\det(V_\infty)$ that does not include C, G, and ϕ, because these terms completely depend on a system under consideration. We then obtain the following result.

Theorem. Suppose Eq. (6) has a unique steady solution V_∞. Then, the estimation error $\det(V_\infty)$ has the following achievable bounds for any C, G, and ϕ:

$$\begin{aligned} \det(V_\infty) &\geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta} \quad (\text{if} \ \ C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\Sigma C_\mathrm{i} \leq 0), \\ \det(V_\infty) &\geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \quad (\text{if} \ \ C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\Sigma C_\mathrm{i} > 0). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof is done by a straightforward calculation. Without loss of generality, we can assume that C_r is normalized: $C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}C_\mathrm{r} = 1$. Let $\bar{C}_\mathrm{r}$ be a unit real vector orthogonal to C_r, i.e., $\bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\bar{C}_\mathrm{r} = 1$ and $C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}\bar{C}_\mathrm{r} = 0$, and define

$$v_1 := C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}V_\infty C_\mathrm{r}, \quad v_2 := C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}V_\infty \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}, \quad v_3 := \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}V_\infty \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}.$$

Then, as $(C_\mathrm{r}, \bar{C}_\mathrm{r})$ is a 2×2 orthogonal matrix, we have

$$\det(V_\infty) = \det\Big[\begin{pmatrix} C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T} \\ \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T} \end{pmatrix} V_\infty (C_\mathrm{r}, \bar{C}_\mathrm{r})\Big] = v_1 v_3 - v_2^2.$$

Furthermore, let us define

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & a_2 \\ a_3 & a_4 \end{pmatrix} &:= \begin{pmatrix} C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}A'C_\mathrm{r} & C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}A'\bar{C}_\mathrm{r} \\ \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}A'C_\mathrm{r} & \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}A'\bar{C}_\mathrm{r} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} d_1 & d_2 \\ d_2 & d_3 \end{pmatrix} &:= \begin{pmatrix} C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}DC_\mathrm{r} & C_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}D\bar{C}_\mathrm{r} \\ \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}DC_\mathrm{r} & \bar{C}_\mathrm{r}^\mathsf{T}D\bar{C}_\mathrm{r} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $D^\top = D$. With the above notations, the algebraic Riccati equation $\dot{V}_\infty = 0$ is reduced to

$$2a_1v_1 + 2a_2v_2 + d_1 - \frac{4\eta}{\hbar}v_1^2 = 0, \tag{8}$$

$$a_3v_1 + (a_1 + a_4)v_2 + a_2v_3 + d_2 - \frac{4\eta}{\hbar}v_1v_2 = 0, \tag{9}$$

$$2a_3v_2 + 2a_4v_3 + d_3 - \frac{4\eta}{\hbar}v_2^2 = 0. \tag{10}$$

Then, adding $v_2^2\times$(8), $-2v_1v_2\times$(9), and $v_1^2\times$(10), we readily obtain

$$2(v_1v_3 - v_2^2)(a_2v_2 - a_4v_1) = d_3v_1^2 - 2d_2v_1v_2 + d_1v_2^2.$$

This together with Eq. (8) leads to

$$\det(V_\infty) = \frac{\hbar}{4\eta}\cdot\frac{d_3v_1^2 - 2d_2v_1v_2 + d_1v_2^2}{v_1^2 - \hbar(a_1+a_4)v_1/2\eta - \hbar d_1/4\eta}.$$

Note that the denominator is strictly positive from the assumption that the Riccati equation has a unique steady solution. Now, calculating d_i, e.g., $d_1 = \hbar(1-\eta)(C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i})^2$, the numerator of $\det(V_\infty)$ is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} &d_3v_1^2 - 2d_2v_1v_2 + d_1v_2^2 \\ &\quad = \hbar v_1^2 + \hbar(1-\eta)\big[(\bar{C}_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i})v_1 - (C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i})v_2\big]^2 \geq \hbar v_1^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which we have

$$\det(V_\infty) \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta}\cdot\frac{v_1^2}{v_1^2 - \hbar(a_1+a_4)v_1/2\eta - \hbar d_1/4\eta}.$$

The right-hand side of the above inequality is further evaluated as follows. First, if $a_1 + a_4 = 2(\eta-1)C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} = 0$, which implies $d_1 = 0$, we immediately obtain $\det(V_\infty) \geq \hbar^2/4\eta$. Second, if $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} < 0$, which implies $a_1 + a_4 > 0$ and $d_1 > 0$, we have $\det(V_\infty) > \hbar^2/4\eta$. Finally, let us consider the case of $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} > 0$ that leads to $a_1 + a_4 < 0$ and $d_1 > 0$; a simple calculation clarifies that the function $f(v) = v^2/(v^2 + av - b)$, $(a > 0, b > 0)$ satisfies $f(v) \geq 4b/(4b + a^2)$ when $v > 0$ and $v^2 + av - b > 0$. This lower bound becomes η in our problem where $a = -\hbar(a_1 + a_4)/2\eta$ and $b = \hbar d_1/4\eta$. As a result, we obtain $\det(V_\infty) \geq \hbar^2/4$ in this case. The achievability of the above lower bounds is discussed in the example part. ■

We now give a physical interpretation to the sign of $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i}$. To do this, let us focus on the matrix A, which corresponds to the drift term of the quantum dynamics (2) and the filter (4). The characteristic polynomial of A is $\lambda^2 + 2(C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i})\lambda + (C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i})^2 + \det(G) = 0$. Hence, A has two stable eigenvalues if and only if the conditions

$$C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} > 0, \quad (C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i})^2 + \det(G) > 0 \tag{11}$$

are satisfied. The latter condition is easily attained by making the coefficient of C (i.e., the interaction strength) sufficiently large, if the former condition is already satisfied. Therefore, under the condition $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} > 0$, both the quantum dynamics and the filter are (asymptotically) stable in the sense that, roughly speaking, those trajectories are constrained around $\hat{x} = 0$ and $\pi_t(\hat{x}) = 0$. This implies that the fundamental estimation limit $\hbar^2/4\eta$ can be violated if the dynamics we aim to track is stable. Combining the theorem with the above discussion, we deduce the following fact:

$$\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta} \quad \text{(if the system is unstable)},$$

$$\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle \geq \frac{\hbar^2}{4} \quad \text{(if the system is stable)}.$$

Remark 1. In practice we cannot construct a perfect measurement apparatus with $\eta = 1$. Thus, the condition $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} > 0$ is clearly preferable from the estimation performance viewpoint. Actually, for example when $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} \leq 0$ and $\eta = 1/4$, the estimation error is lower bounded by $\hbar^2$, i.e., $\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle \geq \hbar^2$, which is much bigger than the Heisenberg limit $\hbar^2/4$. However, the sign of $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i}$ cannot be changed by tuning the Hamiltonian matrix G and the phase-shift ϕ. (Note that $C_{\rm r}^\top\Sigma C_{\rm i} = {\rm Re}(C)^\top\Sigma{\rm Im}(C)$.) In other words, only the interaction term C is the crucial factor that determines the estimation limit.

Remark 2. The Hamiltonian of the form $\hat{H} = \hat{x}^\top G\hat{x}/2 - \hat{x}^\top\Sigma Bu_t$, where $B \in \mathbb{R}^2$, allows that the system dynamics

$$d\hat{x}_t = A\hat{x}_t dt + Bu_t + {\rm i}\Sigma[Cd\hat{B}_t^\dagger - C^* d\hat{B}_t]$$

can be controlled using a feedback input $u_t \in \mathcal{Y}_t$. For example, the quantum linear quadratic gaussian (LQG) controller effectively stabilizes the system. However, any control input cannot reduce the estimation limit, because the error covariance matrix V_t obeys the same Riccati equation (6) without respect to B and u_t.

We will show that the two bounds in the theorem are tight in a sense that there exists at least one example where the equality holds in each case.

Example 1. Doherty *et. al.* considered in [18] a single particle system with the following harmonic oscillator potential and the interaction with strength $\alpha > 0$:

$$\hat{H} = \frac{m\omega^2}{2}\hat{q}^2 + \frac{1}{2m}\hat{p}^2, \quad \hat{c} = \sqrt{2\alpha}\hat{q}.$$

This corresponds to

$$G = \begin{pmatrix} m\omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/m \end{pmatrix}, \quad C = \sqrt{2\alpha}\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C_{\rm r} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2\alpha}\cos\phi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad C_{\rm i} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2\alpha}\sin\phi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

First, we remark that the Ricatti equation (6) has a unique steady solution V_∞ for all the parameters. Then, due to $C_{\rm r}^{\sf T}\Sigma C_{\rm i}=0$, the estimation error is bounded by

$$\det(V_\infty)\geq\frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta}\quad\Rightarrow\quad\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle\geq\frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta}.$$

Actually, the drift matrix A has eigenvalues $\pm{\rm i}\omega$, implying that the particle is oscillating with frequency ω, and thus that the system is not stable. Furthermore, in this case, we can obtain a simple explicit form of $\det(V_\infty)$:

$$\det(V_\infty)=\frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta}\Big(\frac{1-\eta}{\cos^2\phi}+\eta\Big),$$

which attains $\hbar^2/4\eta$ when $\phi=0$. Therefore, the lower bound $\hbar^2/4\eta$ is indeed achievable. In particular, when $\phi=0$ we have

$$\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle=\frac{\hbar^2}{4\eta}+\frac{\hbar^2/4\eta}{\sqrt{r_1^2+r_1+\hbar^2/4\eta}},$$

where $r_1=\hbar m\omega^2/8\eta\alpha$. Thus, in the limit of $r_1\to\infty$ the estimation error satisfies the minimum uncertainty relation $\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle=\hbar^2/4\eta$, which further attains the Heisenberg limit $\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle=\hbar^2/4$ only when $\eta=1$.

Example 2. Wiseman and Doherty considered in [19] an atomic system in a damped cavity containing an on-threshold parametric down converter that realizes

$$\hat{H}=\frac{\beta}{2}(\hat{q}\hat{p}+\hat{p}\hat{q}),\quad\hat{c}=\gamma(\hat{q}+{\rm i}\hat{p}),$$

where $\beta>0$ and $\gamma>0$ are parameters. We then have

$$G=\left(\begin{array}{cc}0&\beta\\ \beta&0\end{array}\right),\quad C=\gamma\left(\begin{array}{c}1\\ {\rm i}\end{array}\right),$$
$$C_{\rm r}=\gamma\left(\begin{array}{c}\cos\phi\\ -\sin\phi\end{array}\right),\quad C_{\rm i}=\gamma\left(\begin{array}{c}\sin\phi\\ \cos\phi\end{array}\right).$$

The Ricatti equation (6) has a unique steady solution under the condition $\beta+\gamma^2>0$, which is already satisfied. Then, due to $C_{\rm r}^{\sf T}\Sigma C_{\rm i}=\gamma^2>0$, the estimation error is lower bounded by $\hbar^2/4$ from the theorem. This bound is achievable as in the former example. Actually, when $\phi=0$, the off-diagonal term of V_∞ is zero, and eventually we have

$$\langle\Delta\hat{q}_\infty^2\rangle\langle\Delta\hat{p}_\infty^2\rangle=\frac{\hbar^2}{8\eta}\cdot\frac{\sqrt{r_2^2+2(2\eta-1)r_2+1}+r_2+2\eta-1}{1+r_2},$$

where $r_2:=\beta/\gamma^2$. Hence, when $\gamma\to\infty$, which implies that the interaction strength is very large, the Heisenberg limit $\hbar^2/4$ is reached.

---

[1] M. Ozawa, Phys. Rev. A, 67, 042105 (2003).
[2] M. Ozawa, Ann. Phys., 311, 350 (2004).
[3] V. P. Belavkin, J. Multivariate Anal., 42, 171 (1992).
[4] V. P. Belavkin, Commun. Math. Phys., 146, 611 (1992).
[5] V. P. Belavkin, Theory Probab. Appl., 38, 573 (1993).
[6] L. Bouten, M. Guta and H. Maassen, J. Phys. A 37, 3189 (2004).
[7] L. Bouten, R. van Handel, and M. R. James, arXiv:math.OC/0601741 (2006).
[8] L. Thomsen, S. Mancini, and H. M. Wiseman, J. Phys. B, 35, 4937 (2002).
[9] C. Ahn, H. M. Wiseman, and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A, 67, 052310 (2003).
[10] JM. Geremia, J. K. Stockton, and H. Mabuchi, Science, 304, 270-273 (2004).
[11] J. K. Stockton, Ph.D. Thesis, California Institute of Technology, CA (2006).
[12] R. van Handel, J. K. Stockton, and H. Mabuchi, IEEE Trans. Automat. Contr., 50, 768-780, (2005).
[13] M. R. James, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. 7, 198 (2005).
[14] M. Mirrahimi and R. van Handel, SIAM J. Control Optim., 46, 445-467 (2007).
[15] N. Yamamoto, K. Tsumura, and S. Hara, Automatica, 43, 981-992 (2007).
[16] M.Yanagisawa and H. Kimura, in Learning, Control and Hybrid Systems, Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences, vol.241, 294 (Springer-Verlag, 1998).
[17] A. C. Doherty and K. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. A 60, 2700 (1999).
[18] A. C. Doherty, S. M. Tan, A. S. Parkins, and D. F. Walls, Phys. Rev. A 60, 2380 (1999).
[19] H. M. Wiseman, A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 070405 (2005).
[20] J. Gough, arXiv:quant-ph/0504099 (2005).
[21] S. C. Edwards, V. P. Belavkin, arXiv:quant-ph/0506018 (2005).
[22] N. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A 74, 032107 (2006).
[23] S. D. Wilson, A. R. R. Carvalho, J. J. Hope, and M. R. James, Phys. Rev. A 76, 013610 (2007).
[24] R. L. Hudson and K. R. Parthasarathy, Commun. Math. Phys. 93, 301 (1984).